Resolution No. 5

Responsible Government

* **Mr. L. M. Pylee** *(Latin-Christians-Ernakulam)*: Mr. President, Sir, the resolution as tabled here reads thus. "This Council recommends to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja to make immediately a substantial extension of Responsible Government in the State by transferring many more Departments to popular control".

I am sorry, Sir, that my sound-box is a little out of order to-day and I do not mean to make a lengthy speech upon this subject.

At the outset I have to say that this resolution was sent several months ago and at that time I thought I will put forward a very modest demand as stated here namely a substantial extension of responsible Government. Now, Sir, months have passed after I sent up this resolution and the sense and the spirit in which I would look upon the resolution is not for an extension or a substantial extension of responsible Government, but for the introduction of full responsible Government. It may be different from the resolution. I explained my position. Technically I move this resolution according to the wording that you find here but in spirit and in substance I move the resolution asking or requesting the Government not for, as I said before, a partial responsible Government, but full responsible Government. Well, we are so to say at the end of an epoch. The benevolence of His Highness Sir Sree Rama Varma of venerable memory gave us the benefit Cochin Constitution Act and we still remember with what expectations it has been received in the State, how people were glad about it, how they rejoiced and how they felt that it was the beginning of a new era. It was the beginning of freedom, Democratic Government, the dawn of a new epoch. It is with such feelings that the people of Cochin welcomed that benevolent move from the then Ruler and accepted the Cochin Constitution Act. Six years have passed. Much has happened in the world and still we are almost at the beginning. After trying the diarchy for six years we are still at the beginning while many things have happened in the world. We took pride that Cochin was the first Indian State to introduce responsible Government. I remember that there was a very responsible statement from Madras in the columns of the Hindu saying at that time that Mysore had taken the substantial step in the matter of responsible Government. I pointed out that it was not in Mysore that the first step was taken, but it was within our State of Cochin and that without much agitation. We took pride in that costitution, but what has happened after that? A standstill, a stalemate. Six years have passed and we are at the end of a long Council and at least now I hope that full responsible Government should be granted because that is the aim with which the constitution was introduced.

Mr. A. Eachara Menon *(Chittur-Rural)*: Have you progressed?

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan *(Vadakkancheri)*: Does the Hon'ble Member question it?

Mr. L. M. Pylee *(Latin-Christians-Ernakulam)*: Sir, ever since the Cochin Constitution Act came into force repeatedly and incessantly the demand has been brought forward on the floor of this House for more constitutional reforms. Almost at every meeting there has been a resolution, at every Budget Session there has been a cut motion and I remember how during the very first meeting, *i. e.*, the Legislative Session after the introduction of the Cochin Constitution Act, the Hon'ble Deputy President himself as a member of the House moved a resolution and in eloquent terms pleaded for the establishment of responsible Government. Then after that how many members have tabled this resolution, how many of us have pleaded, pleaded vehemently, pleaded consistently for the establishment of full responsible Government or at least for a substantial extension of responsible Government. At first there were objections. As usual treaty obligations and such objections were put forward. But later on it was found that these cannot stand. The House might remember that important pronouncement of Lord Winterton which amounted in substance to this, namely that treaty obligations will not stand in the way of establishing full responsible Government in Indian States and therefore that objection has receded to the background. All these objections have become a myth. So these objections are not advanced now. Still there has been an answer from the Government side always. Always sympathy; Always saying "We will give you but wait. It is only an experiment." I am asking how long is this experiment going on. Have we not experimented for the last seven years and has the responsible Government as established in the State as yet been found wanting. Have we not put it in the balance? Has it not been weighed? I ask again has it been found wanting? Why this delay.

* Speech not corrected by the Hon'ble Member.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Why this disappointment given to the people who expected that the Constitution Act was only the beginning of a new era, the dawn of freedom. But even now we are at the dawn and the sun does not seem to rise. Then the war came to their help. During the war what all transformations are taking place. Is it so very difficult to give an extension of responsible Government in the State? In fact this is the time when that should have been done. For the establishment of a full-fledged Democratic Government in the State this is the most opportune moment. War requires the whole-hearted support of all people and our war efforts would have been much more whole-hearted if this system of Government under the aegis of HisHighness the Maharaja had been established. Just now it comes to my mind, Sir, that in one of the public speeches made by Sir Shanmukham on his return from Europe he gave the reason for introducing responsible Government in the Cochin State. He said that if the introduction of democratic institutions in the State were delayed there might be the danger that the loyalty of the people might be tried. Yes. We are loyal to the core and even if responsible Government has not been established in the State we say we would ever be loyal to our Ruler and the Ruling House. Still, Sir, it struck that Stateman so. He may be right or he may be wrong. I think he was wrong in saying that, with all due reference to his eminent statesmanship. I am sorry that I was not here when a previous resolution upon constitutional reforms had been discussed in the House in the last meeting. But from what I understand, the reasons put forward by the Government side is that the British Indian Constitution is going to be scrapped. Let them do anything they like, Sir. Why should we wait for them to scrape it. Has not Mysore progressed. Have not the petty State of Mirage and Oudh come forward and introduccd responsible Government and why should we, people in Cochin, who take pride in their enlightenment and education wait till the British Indian Constitution with all its complications, with all its political factors is scrapped and see what is happening there, what constitution will be established there in order to amend our Constitution. Certainly not, Sir. The complications that exist in British India do not exist in the State of Cochin. We are a simple people. Our Constitution can be made simple and why not even after waiting for these six years abolish the system of diarchy. I do not call it even diarchy. After all, when you speak of diarchy there should be some sort of equal division. You speak of the Reserved Half and the Transferred Half. Where is the half? It is only a fraction that is transferred. The better half still remains with the Government. We have got a small fraction and there sits the puisne little Minister on the other side of the House. I tell the Government that the system has become a disgrace to the State of Cochin. The Minister sits there like a puisne little figure and diarchy you call it, when such a small fraction of Governmental function is relegated to a Minister and the rest is reserved and kept by the so-called Reserved Half. These are the considerations which I put before the House, Sir. We say we are fighting for democracy. The war is a war for democracy. His Highness has placed all the resources of the State at the disposal of the Paramount Power for the sake of the war and what is the aim of the war. The war is for democracy. When the civilised part of the world is fighting for democracy we are what I would call it, a democracy. It is time that this systems, Sir, is amended. It is time that at least when this Council is closing and when the next Council is coming in that the next step, the full step is taken. We have waited for long long enough. They have lost faith in the good faith of the Government because of the excuses put forward. Whenever a resolution like this is put forward the answer from the Government has been evasive and illusive. I still repeat it. My impression is that this time also the answer will be illusive and evasive as it was.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan *(Vadakkancheri):* They have improved.

Mr. L. M. Pylee *(Latin-Christians-Ernakulam):* I don't know. Therefore, this resolution, technically asking for a substantial extension of responsible Government, but in spirit a prayer for the establishment of full responsible Government, Sir, in that light and in that spirit I beg to move this resolution and commend it to the acceptance of this House.

***Mr. A. V. Moothedan** *(Chalakkudi):* Sir, The Resolution moved by my Hon'ble friend reads thus:

"This Council recommends to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja to make immediately a substantial extension of responsible Government in the State by transferring many more Departments to popular control."

Sir, I am unable to support any of the words contained in the

*Speech not corrected by the Hon'ble Member.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

resolution. But the speech I fully support, because the motion is tabled in a different way.

In the year 1112 during the Budget Sesssion there was a resolution passed unanimously in this House asking for full responsible Government, that a Council of Ministers responsible to the legislature should be established in Cochin State. There was a full scheme and it was passed unanimously by this House and the present Hon'ble Minister and the late Minister Dr. A. R. Menon both supported the resolution and was carried unanimously. In the year 1113 the new reforms were introduced. One Minister for Rural Development was appointed and I find from that day there is a downward progress. Till that day we were asking for full responsible Government and after that every session there used to be a resolution asking for partial reforms, one more minister, two more ministers. I am against these partial reforms. I am against diarchy. Even when the reforms were introduced I have stated in the newspapers my opinion. At the same time the Maharaja has been pleased to grant it as a boon. We shall welcome it in that spirit and work it up. That was the attitude I had taken. Partial responsibility is irresponsibility. When compared to British India we are now in 1919. The Montague-Chelmsford Reforms were introduced in British India in 1919. That is 25 years before. We are behind the clock by 25 years. This system of partial responsibility is not at all right. Now, how can the Hon'ble Minister be blamed for anything. Although he has got responsibility for certain subjects these subjects are so interrelated with other subjects that he cannot act in a free manner. Suppose he wants some money. He cannot go to the Treasury and take the money. There should be procedure. Either we must have no Minister or we must have a Council of Ministers. If they are defeated they will come to this side and the people sitting on this side will go there. There should be full responsible Government. I had expressed a wish when Sir Shanmukham was the Diwan that he should be the last Diwan in the State. After that we had two Diwans. Therefore, sir, there is no use of criticising the Minister for Rural Development. Either we must get the reforms in full or we must reject it. In the present circumstances it cannot be worked in a better way. I am glad to note that the Hon'ble Member for Latin-Christians have brought several points for consideration. He stated that treaty obligations will not be an impediment for the grant of constitutional reforms. In that resolution of 1112 there is a provision there. There it is stated that the Government of Cochin shall be carried on by a Council of Ministers responsible to the legislature. Subject to that there were certain provisions provided, that responsibility for treaty obligations, relationships with foreign powers and great emergency affecting peace and tranquility of the State, for these matters the Maharaja has got full powers. I shall explain. The position is like this. The Ministers are responsible for the whole administration of the State. Regarding treaty relations with the Crown, the Minister is not responsible. Suppose the Council of Ministers recommends certain proposals which affect the treaty relations. Then the Maharaja can say I cannot accept that. We do not want a Diwan. The Concil of Ministers will have these powers. They are responsible only to the Maharaja in matters relating to treaty obligations and in great emergency affecting the peace and tranquility of the State. In other matters the Ministers will have to abide by the decision of the Council. That is the provision we made in the cut motion of 1112. That is the way in which in British India it is done. In British India there are certain subjects where the Council of Ministers has no power. In matters affecting minority the Governor has got power to interfere. In the case of great emergency affecting the peace and tranquility the Governor can act against the wishes of the Council of Ministers. Likewise here also we may have full responsible government with the proviso that the Maharaja will have absolute powers in the matter of treaty relations. Therefore, treaty obligations will not stand as an impediment. My friend submitted that we are having not half and half. I am sure that more than half the criticisma are levelled against the Minister. If he has got a fraction of the subjects for administration he gets more his share of criticism than the other half. If we examine the cut motions during the Budget Session and the interpellations during the question hour it will be seen that all these interpellations and all these criticisms are levelled against the Hon'ble Minister.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan (*Vadakkancheri*): And that from a particular corner also.

Mr. A. V. Moothedan (*Chalakkudi*): Which corner I am not concerned with. Even in spite of all this the Hon'ble Minister is going on. We are going on in a very constitutional manner. What I say is that there is no harm if a Council of Ministers is appointed, I can say that the administration will go on as before and it will be better. When they get responsibility even though they are sitting here they will view matters and problems from a different standpoint.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

If a Council of Ministers is appointed there will be no calamity in the State. It will be more efficient than the present Government. When we look into the several resolutions passed during the past seven years we arrive at an absurdity. Sometimes we say one or two departments. Sometimes we say that a Committee may be appointed for devising ways and means for the establishment of responsible government. Now we want full responsible Government. I say all these resolutions should be cancelled. Only one simple motion is necessary and that is we want a Government responsible to the legislature, a Council of Ministers responsible to the legislature. Except that resolution, all the other resolutions should be deleted. The whole thing is in confusion. The issue is not clear. What I want to suggest is that a Council of Ministers must be appointed Then there will not be the Diwan. There will be an elected President. Even without establishing full responsible Government we can have an elected President. By that I do'nt mean to cast any aspersion on the succesive Presidents of the Council. It is our right. We must have a non-official President. That is a reform which can be carried out without any difficulty at all. Sir, in the House of Commons the Great Churchill has to stand there while the speaker is there. That position ought to be the position of the Diwan. Not here. What is the objection? Will the Speaker go against the Constitution? I find that there will be an impression that the Presi dent will be a power to the non-officials. This is the last time I will be addressing this House on the subject. I had been fighting tooth and nail against communal electorates and I repeat that has spoilt our State. Why do you create this complication. The people are living very harmoniously. Why are they classified into different groups. In British India there is a lot of difference. But why do we copy the system obtaining in British India and spoil our people by unnecessary divisions. *(Hear, hear)*. I find from my own experience that communal rancour has become more acute in this Council than in the previous Council.

Mr. Deputy President: Mr. Moothedan, we are not now on the question of franchise.

Mr. A. V. Moothedan *(Chalakkudi):* If the Hon'ble President is going to be strict then the resolution itself should not have been moved.

In the Constitution Act there is a provision for special communal electorate and when we speak about the Constitutional Reforms I think I can speak about communal electorates. If the Hon'ble President thinks otherwise I do not want to speak anything upon that. Therefore, these are some of the suggestions that I would like to place before the House.

***Mr. A. B. Salem** *(Mattancheri):* Mr. President, Sir, this resolution from being an annual thing has become by-annual and now it has become quarterly. It only shows that the people of Cochin are insisting upon further reforms. Sir, the one reason why after the resolution of 1112 the same kind of resolutions were not being moved in the Council is because of the Government of Cochin Act. *(Hear, hear)*. The Government of Cochin Act accepted the principle of responsible Government in Cochin.

Mr. A. V. Moothedan *(Chalakkudi):* Was it passsed by this House ?

***Mr. A. B. Salem** *(Mattancheri):* Whether it was passed by the House or not we have got this Constitution Act. After that there is no meaning in asking the Government to give us Responsible Government. Responsible Government has been conceded and granted by His Highness and had been agreed to all these years. Therefore the further resolutions that came in this House after 1112 followed the lines on the Constitution Act. To-day there is nothing to prevent His Highness from transferring every subject and every portfolio to the hands of the Ministers appointed by him. All that is necessary is to persuade His Highness to transfer more and more departments to the Ministry, whether it is manned by a single person or manned by more than one person. I am not here to suggest that the Diwanship of Cochin should be completely abolished.

Mr. A. V. Moothedan *(Chalakkudi):* That is what is meant by Responsible Government.

Mr. A. B. Salem *(Mattancheri):* The Diwanship need not be abolished. I am not one for that. Let the Diwanship remain. Wherever there is a Maharaja, there is a Diwan. Wherever there is a Majesty, there is a Governor or Governor-General. Similarly in the Indian States the Diwanship is an ornament. Instead of becoming the seat of full power and the exercise of full power let it become an ornament which would give advice to the Council of Ministers, if necessary, as the Advisor of His Highness the Maharaja. The Diwan can advise in regard to treaty obligations, etc. My Hon'ble friend from Chalakkudi was telling that His Highness shall act against the wishes of the Minister with regard to treaty rights. His Highness does not act at all. His Highness is beyond controversy. Whatever orders he passes are passed behind the

* Speech not corrected by the Hon'ble Member.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

screen and are carried out by Executive Officers. In such matters like treaty obligations, etc., which have to be carried out, which are bound to be carried out, whether we wish it or not, in such matters the action may pass through the Diwan. But, in matters of internal administration of day-to-day affairs it is our right and our privilege to have it carried out by our own people. Sir, to-day I have no hesitation in saying that the Government of Cochin is crrried on by the people of Cochin. We have only one Diwan from our side. The Police Commissioner came by accident from outside and he will go out by accident. But otherwise our people are manning many departments and there is no case that our officers have been inefficient. I find it is said that our officers are more alert and more efficient than many officers elsewhere in British India and other places. Our Food Director has given many points to the other Directors. They say our rationing here in Cochin which was first introduced in Cochin is working in the best manner possible in the whole of India. Our Chief Medical Officer is found to be so very efficient that the Military people are demanding his services. Therefore, I submit that it is unnecessary for the Diwanship to be abolished. But if our own men can man the beaurocracy and carry on the administration of the affairs of the country, there is no reason why a Council of Ministers drawn from the elected representatives of the people of the State who come into this Council should be found inefficient to carry on the administration and I have said that if we want more there will be a Diwan also to give them advice behind the screen. Then there is His Highness also. So, we can carry on as a happy family looking after our own affairs. Sir, I ask the question, has not responsible Government been well-worked inside the State ? My hon'ble friend from Chalakkudi said that all questions have been turned to the Minister. That is the right thing to do. In responsible Government the responsible man is asked questions and not the irresponsible man. What is the use of our asking questions to the other Reserved Half ? No use at all! Whatever they may do we cannot turn them out.

Mr. A. V. Moothedan *(Chalakkudi):* Why are you here ?

Mr. A. B. Salem *(Mattancheri):* We have turned out a Minister, because he did not satisfy us, and now we are heckling another Minister.

Mr. V. K. Bhaskara Menon *(Cranganur):* We are not.

Mr. A. B. Salem *(Mattancheri):* You may not be, but there are others in other corners. That shows that when a Council of Ministers comes here, we will have to remember that for every action of theirs they are responsible to this House. They will be heckled in this House, if they do not give us satisfaction we will turn them out also. That is responsible Government. We have shown to the Government and to His Highness the Maharaja that we know how to work responsible Government by these questions and resolutions. Therefore, this fire of criticism in this House is a deterrent that will keep any Minister or a Council of Ministers in proper working order because we will be the watch-dogs here, and therefore the people of Cochin have demonstrated how to work responsible Government, and therefore that is an additional ground to give us a further extension of responsible Government. The resolution is correct. The system has already been changed. It is extension that is required. More and more extension, we should have Ministers here instead of beaurocratic people who have to work in the respective chairs as Heads of Departments or in the Secretariat, they have no place here. They are really an anomaly here. Are they responsible for their actions? They may be people speaking with their tongues in their cheek. They may be exactly speaking opposite to what their feelings are. They are speaking according to orders. There should be one person who should sit there and answer, and that is the Diwan. That is the one gentleman who can stifle us with his "Order, order". That is the person that should be questioned and that is the person that should answer for his orders. Instead of that we are getting a block of 12 heads to answer like automatons. That is the picture that we have here. Such a picture you won't find if responsible Government comes. What did happen after the Minister came? So many Heads of Departments disappeared from here—Industries disappeared; Public Health disappeared, Agriculture disappeared, Co-operation disappeared. That is the chief thing. Therefore, when the Council of Ministers come, they will take three or four of them and they will go to their seats and the Minister will answer. That is a very important matter of reform. Don't run away with the idea that the presence of Government servants—Heads of Departments—is conducive for good administration. You just heard a person saying "Salem; how many bags of sugar you got?" What is the idea? Favouritism. What is the other idea when I am going to criticise

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

them to their faces, and then you go to do business with them. Naturally as human-beings they are also swayed with passions like anybody else and therefore that idea of passions or favouritism playing should be avoided in Parliamentary responsible Government. That is why Ministers stand and answer while their servants who carry out their orders need not answer, because they are only carrying out orders. Therefore, if we have a Council of Ministers, our officers will be still more efficient because they have to give their explanation to responsible men who can deal with them, who can punish them, who can force them, who can subject them to their discipline, whereas now what can they do? They will say "we have got instructions to oppose the resolution, to answer the questions in such and such a way". That is the danger.

Mr. Deputy President: Mr. Salem, your time is up.

Mr. A. B. Salem *(Mattancheri):* I will take a few minutes more.

Mr. Deputy President: You had only 10 minutes. You have already taken 15 minutes.

Mr. A. B. Salem *(Mattancheri):* I did not look at the clock when I began to speak. Otherwise I would have cut my coat according to the cloth.

Mr. Deputy President: I shall give you one minute more.

Mr. A. B. Salem *(Mattancheri):* Then I don't want to speak;

Mr. A. V. Moothedan *(Chalakkudi):* Sir, with the permission of the Chair, I wish to ask one question to the Hon'ble Member for Mattancheri. The Hon'ble Member stated in the course of his speech that affairs like treaty with the Crown may be handed over to the Diwan. I ask the Hon'ble Member. why not the function be entrusted to the Council of Ministers?

Mr. A. B. Salem *(Mattancheri):* If any Member of the Ministry is responsible to this House and the House presses the Minister to do a thing in a particular way, the Minister will either have to act in that way or to go out. Those are matters beyond the realm of responsibilities When the British Resident sends the letter, can anybody resist it? You know that all the Defence of India Orders have been copied here, whether we like it or not. Therefore, there must be a person who is not within the realm of responsibility. The Diwan being appointed by His Highness can be removed only by His Highness. He is responsible to His Highness and he holds office at His Highness' pleasure. So, he can carry on those irresponsible things. If we get an experienced man like our present Diwan, there is no objection to his tendering advice to the Council of Ministers behind the screen. In that way, we will have harmonious administration, efficient administration and well-advised administration and our Council of Ministers will always be glad to get advice to carry on the administration. I think I have spoken everything. I am so interested in the subject that I am carried away. I may tell my Hon'ble friend from Chalakkudi that in all constitutions the King is always in theory absolute, but in practice he does not exercise his absolute powers.

Mr. A. V. Moothedan *(Chalakkudi):* That I know.

Mr. A. B. Salem *(Mattancheri):* Therefore, I hope that in the next Council some such reforms may be initiated and given as a boon of further reforms in our State to our people. After all, we are all one family. His Higness' subjects we are. We are his children. We will do everything to carry on the administration in the best manner possible to give as much satisfaction as we could to His Highness the Maharaja, who could watch and see how we act.

***Mr. C. V. Iyyu** *(Kunnamkulam):* Of cours, the resoultion as it stands sounds very welcome Professor Pylee—I mean the Hon'ble Member for Latin Christians-Ernakulam—is a Professor of Political science and he has practically more to do and in his life he had more experience to deal with young minds and also with books. The question of discussion of responsible Government in this House has practically become a sort of academic question and probably it is in the fitness of things that a professor of political science took it up as a sort of academic question. But in practice, and the public opinion in the State has gone far, far out of our colleges and Professor Pylee who has been for more time out of the State, as far as I can say, has gone down to the level of a school-boy politician. In the last Budget Session as a practical man who has nothing to do with young minds and no occasion to deal with chidren or books of political science or book of history, as a practical man who has to deal with masses of all classes and creeds, I have found that the general consensus of opinion of the people is that the people would like to return to the old benevelent autocracy of our Ruler (*shame*). It has come to that. I am speaking the truth.

Mr. T. K. Nayar *(Minister for Rural Development):* Which people do you mean? Do you mean the people of Cochin?

Mr. C. V. Iyyu *(Kunnamkulam):* I mean the people of the State.

*Speech not corrected by the Hon'ble Member.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. T. K. Nayar *(Minister for Rural Development):* Whom do you represent? Do you represent the people?

Mr. C. V. Iyyu *(Kunnamkulam):* I represent the people of my constituency.

Mr. T. K. Nayar *(Minister for Rural Development):* You represent nobody.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan *(Vadakkancheri):* What is the census figure of the Kunnamkulam Constituency.

Mr. A. V. Moothedan *(Chalakkudi):* The constituency does not want you. They have no confidence in you.

Mr. C. V. Iyyu *(Kunnamkulam):* You will see that. I am on the eve of the election and I am facing the question. I suggested in my resolution, rather in a cut motion, that the Transferred Departments may be given back to the Diwan. Conditions have come to such a state. I will enter into details later.

Mr. K. S. Paniker *(Ezhuvas-Mukunnapuram):* On a point of order, ഈ വക സംഗതിക ളെ സംബന്ധിച്ച് മെമ്പർമാർ തമ്മിൽ ലഹളകൂട്ടുവാൻ ഇവിടെ അനുവദിക്കാമൊ?

Mr. Deputy President: The Chair will decide that. The Hon'ble Member may resume his seat.

Mr. C. V. Iyyu *(Kunnamkulam):* I had during the last Budget Session to save the situation, moved a motion that the Transferred Departments now managed by the Minister may be given back to the Diwan for overhaul.

Mr. A. V. Moothedan *(Chalakkudi):* Was it passed? It was rejected by a large majority.

Mr. C. V. Iyyu *(Kunnamkulam):* This House is responsible for postponing the advent of responsible Government. If it had been done as recommended by me, I think even before Vrischigam we would have had full responsible Government. This House, a majority of this House, was responsible for delaying further reforms. Had they accepted my own position and the Hon'ble Minister had the boldness to hand over to the Diwan for everhaul the Departments and if such an experienced administrator as our present Diwan had certified that the administration of these Transferred Departments were perfect, then responaible Government would have been granted long ago. The Diwan would have advised His Highness to grant responsible Government and he might have resigned and gone away. The majority of the House delayed.

I may also bring to the notice of this House that during the last Vrischigam Meeting, I tabled some questions in this House about a land acqisition question in the Tiruvilwamala Village. The whole file was here. Under the order of the Ministry of Rural Development a notification was gazetted for a land acquisition and the aggrieved party had to put petition to His Highness, submit memorials to His Highness who had to interfere in the matter.

Mr. A. V. Moothedan *(Chalakkudi):* Did His Highness interfere?

Mr. C. V. Iyyu *(Kunnamkulam):* Yes, interfered.

Mr. A. V. Moothedan *(Chalakkudi):* With what result

Mr. C. V. Iyyu *(Kunnamkulam):* The order of the Ministry had to be reconsidered by an officer of the Government under the Reserved Half, The whole land aqcuisition had to be changed.

Mr. P. Kmaran Ezhuthassan *(Vadakkancheri):* It is wrong, Sir.

Mr. C. V. Iyyu *(Kunnamkulam):* It was changed, at least an inch was changed.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan *(Vadakkancheri):* A change was recommended, that is all.

Mr. V. K. Bhaskara Menon *(Cranganur):* An inch of what, Sir,

Mr. C. V. Iyyu *(Kunnamkulam):* The proposals had to be changed.

Mr. A. B. Salem *(Mattancheri);* Is it a relevant matter to discuss on a resolution of this kind?

Mr. Deputy President: He is against the resolution. Therefore he may have to show why he is against it. Therefore he is being allowed. Mr. Iyyu,you may take 3 minutes more.

Mr. C. V. Iyyu *(Kunnamkulam):* That is rather hard, Sir. You showed some consideration to the Hon'ble Member for Mattancheri and also may shown the same consideration And I have to answer so many questions. Otherwise, I may not have any chance to place my case before the House.

Mr. T. K. Nayar *(Minister for Rural Development):* Sir, I request you to allow me to make a personal statement, because such a reference has been made by the Hon'ble Member. I

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

wish to explain the whole position. The people of Cochin should not be allowed to be led away by such statements.

Mr. Deputy President : Let him finish his speech.

Mr. T. K. Nayar *(Minister for Rural Development):* Sir, We cannot allow such things to be tolerated in this House. You know I have been on that side, and now I am here as the Popular Minister, and I am to put up with all this. But there is a limit for personal criticism, and even for malice there must be a limit.

Mr. C. V. Iyyu *(Kunnamkulam) :* It is not personal criticism.

Mr. T. K. Nayar *(Minister for Rural Development) :* All my actions are subject to scrutiny by the Hon'ble House. But there should be a limit.

Mr. Deputy President : The Hon'ble Minister can explain things after the speech is over.

Mr. C. V. Iyyu *(Kunnamkulam) :* Even yesterday, we have received an answer from the Hon'ble Minister that the time and labour involved to find out what all amounts were spent for departmental works under Panchayats was not answered by the Minister. I could understand if such a reply came from the Diwan Peishkar or the Secretary to Government, Such a thing has not been done here. That could have been easily done and surely a large number of people would have been enfranchised and we could have, I think, attempted to try whether a more representative body or a better class of Council Members would be returned.

Mr. A. B. Salem *(Mattancheri) :* You are the worst that have come.

Mr. C. V. Iyyu *(Kunnamkulam):* May be. We could have tried.

Mr. Deputy President: Your time is up.

Mr. T. K. Nayar *(Minister for Rural Development):* Sir, regarding the acquisition question, the Hon'ble Member for Kunnamkulam was saying that the aggrieved parties had to put petition to His Highness, to submit memorials to His Highness and that His Highness had to interfere in the actions of the Minister. The facts are these; I get hundreds of reports from the Panchayat Department for acquisition purposes, survey numbers so and so, in such and such a village, in such and such a panchayat may be acquired for a road. The Minister who is at Ernakulam is not expected to know all these places. He simply says, yes.

Mr. C. V. Iyyu *(Kunnamkulam):* But the Minister belongs to Thiruvilwamala.

Mr. T. K. Nayar *(Minister for Rural Development):* From the Thiruvilwamala Panchayat also thousand and one proposals may come. I am afraid the Hon'ble Member refuses to be convinced.

Mr. C. V. Iyyu *(Kunnamkulam):* We are open to conviction.

Mr. T. K. Nayar *(Minister for Rural Development) :* You are not. If you are, you would have been convinced when I gave the reply.

Mr. K. S. Panicker *(Ezhuvas-Mukundapuram) :* It is a mistaken notion.

Mr. T. K. Nayar *(Minister for Rural Development):* The aggrieved party generally puts in a petition to the Government. That is the usual procedure in all such cases when Government orders acquisitions. The aggrieved generally complains to the Government. Then only they seriously take up the question. Then they send that petition to the departmental head, the departmental head makes a local enquiry; because the recommendation is that of the Panchayat, the departmental head would not have originally gone to the spot and made local enquiries. When Government get such a petition, it is forwarded to the departmental head. He goes to the spot, makes a local enquiry and then submits his report and Government pass orders on that. At times these acqusitions are dropped. But in this particular case, the parties did not put in any petition to the Government. So the Government had no opportunity to make any enquiry in the usual course. The Minister got this acquisition proposal and he approved it. One fine morning, the Sarvadhikariakar to His Highness forwards these petitions. It is a complaint against the Minister and His Highness wisely directed his Diwan Peishkar to make an enquiry. It is a complaint against the Minister.....

Mr. C. V. Iyyu *(Kunnamulam):* That was what I was saying—the Diwan Peishkar, a member of the Reserved Half, enquiring about a complaint against the Minister.

Mr. T K. Nayar *(Minister for Rural Development):* The complaint was against the action of the Minister. There was one printed petition circulated in the last Council sitting here—although the signatory is not a party who actually petitioned to His Highness—my friend got wrong information—I don't want to press him with that. That is a different matter. The Diwan Peishkar went to the spot, he suggested certain deviations, to which the parties agreed. The report of the Diwan Peishkar was forwarded to His Highness and His Highness sanctioned the proposals.

Mr. C.V. Iyyu *(Kunnamkulam):* No self-respecting Minister could have continued in office

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. T. K. Nayar *(Minister for Rural Development):* My notion of self-respect is not as my Hon'ble friend conceives it. There is absolutely nothing affecting self-respect in it. The parties misunderstood things. They could have petitioned the Government and they would have got even something better. You can advise your clients.

Mr. C. V. Iyyu *(Kunnamkulam):* I have no clients

Mr. T. K. Nayar *(Minister for Rural Development) :* Even something better would have happened. Because it is something connected with the Minister, and I am living closeby, and because there was an allegation that the road leads to the Minister's house. I would have advised, I personally would have advised them to drop the whole thing, but I was not given an opportunity. That is apart from the point. Strictly I should not do it, but being ultra-sentimental, I would have done that. That is the explanation. The House may take it for what it is worth.

The second thing is about yesterday's question about departmental execution of works. The Hon'ble Member for Kunnamkulam put a question regarding the details of the names of works in the various Panchayats executed departmentally during the tenure of office of the present Minister. How much time will take? The Hon'ble Member heard that my brother-in-law who happens to be the Panchayat President took up some work in the Panchayat, it seems to be the construction of some tank and that after construction it collapsed, and that he being my brother-in-law, I paid him something more to reconstruct the whole thing. I will give you the details if you want.

Mr. C. V. Iyyu *(Kunnamkulam):* Before the Council is over?

Mr. T. K. Nayar *(Minister for Rural Development):* Not before the Council is over, but I will give it now. The work collapsed. It was not due to any bad work. Due to the current in the well—it was an old tank and the work was to put earth in some portion and construct a smaller one or so and it collapsed. On that account not a pie was given. Many works are being done like that.

Mr. A. B. Salem *(Mattancheri):* What is wrong in it even if it was paid?

Mr. T. K. Nayar *(Minister for Rural Development) :* It was not paid. If it was paid, then the implication will be that because he happens to be my brother-in-law, he was shown a favour.

Further, the Minister is not doing all these things. There is a department. The Panchayat is directly under the Panchayat Director. He makes certain recommendations. Wherever possible if it could be allowed and if it is found reasonable it is allowed, and if found unreasonable it is disallowed. The Minister is not dealing with these matters directly. These are my explanations for these two things. I think I have been able to satisfy any sensible and reasonable man among the public of Cochin. But I admit my defeat so far as the Hon'ble Member for Kunnamkulam is concerned.

Mr. C. V. Iyyu *(Kunnamkulam):* On a point of information, Sir, was not the very same land acquisition proposal made when the Hon'ble Minister was the Panchayat President and the previous Minister was the Minister.

Mr. Deputy President: I cannot allow a discussion on this subject.

Mr. T. K. Nayar *(Minister for Rural Development):* Sir, it is a relevant matter and I request I may be allowed to answer that question. So that the matter may be cleared up.

Mr. Deputy President: Yes.

Mr. T. K. Nayar *(Minister for Rural Development):* I forgot to refer that point. I may say for the information of the House that the proposal did not emanate from the Panchayat. It emanated from the Panchayat Department itself. Go through the files and you will see it. It did not emanate from the Panchayat President. My predecessor in office visited the place; he ordered the acquisition to be dropped. I was the Panchayat President there. I was a member of the Council also. I did not raise a single question as my Hon'ble friend is doing now.

Mr. K. S. Panicker *(Ezhuvas-Mukundapuram):* I sent a question.

Mr. T. K. Nayar *(Minister for Rural Development) :*That is your outlook. As an aggrived party, I could have sent a question. But I am not of that type.

*മിസ്റ്റർ പി. നാരായണമേനോൻ: ഞാൻ ഈ പ്രമേയത്തെ അനുകൂലിക്കുന്നു. ബഹു മാനപ്പെട്ട കുന്നംകുളംപ്രതിനിധി ഇവിടെ പ്രകടിപ്പിച്ച അഭിപ്രായം കൊച്ചീരാജ്യത്തു് അധിവസിക്കുന്ന ജനസാമാന്യത്തിന്റേതോ കുന്നംകുളത്തുകാരുടേതോ ആണെന്നു ഞാൻ വിശ്വസിക്കുന്നില്ല. (ഹിയർ, ഹിയർ)

*Speech not corrected by the Hon'ble Member.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. C. V. Iyyu (*Kunnamkulam*) : I did not oppose the resolution. I said it was delayed by the party in power.

മിസ്റ്റർ പി. നാരായണമേനോൻ : പ്രജായത്തഭരണത്തിനുവേണ്ടി ഭയങ്കരസമരം ചെയ്തുകൊണ്ടിരിക്കുന്ന ഇക്കാലത്തു ഫസ്റ്റ്-ാം നൂറ്റാണ്ടിൽപോലും ജീവിച്ചിരുന്ന ഒരു മനുഷ്യർ സ്വപ്നം കാണുകപോലും ചെയ്യാത്തവിധത്തിൽ ഇങ്ങിനെയൊരു അഭിപ്രായം പുറപ്പെടുവിച്ചതു് അദ്ദേഹത്തിന്റെ കുറവാണെന്നു ഞാൻ വിശ്വസിക്കുന്നില്ല.

Mr. C. V. Iyyu (*Kunnamkulam*): I have not opposed the resolution. The Hon'ble Member is wrong.

മിസ്റ്റർ പി. നാരായണമേനോൻ : അതു യഥാർത്ഥത്തിൽ നമ്മുടെ ഗവൺമെണ്ടിന്റെ തെറ്റാണു്. വിദ്യാഭ്യാസവകുപ്പു് ജനങ്ങൾക്കധീനമായിരുന്നുവെന്നുണ്ടെങ്കിൽ ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട കന്നംകളം പ്രതിനിധിയേപ്പോലെ നമ്മുടെ രാജ്യത്തു അപൂർവ്വം ചില പിൻതിരിപ്പന്മാരെ പ്രത്യേകിച്ചു് കണ്ടുപിടിച്ചു് അവക്കുപ്രത്യേകിച്ചു് രാഷ്ട്രീയ ക്ലാസ്സുകൾവെച്ചു് അവരെ ഇന്നത്തെ നൂറ്റാണ്ടിലേക്കു കൊണ്ടുവരുവാൻ സാധിച്ചില്ലെങ്കിലും ഫസ്റ്റ്-ാംനൂറ്റാണ്ടിന്റെ ആദ്യചട്ടത്തിലേക്കെങ്കിലും കൊണ്ടുവരാൻ സാധിക്കുമോ എന്നു് പരീക്ഷിച്ചുനോക്കാമായിരുന്നു.

മിസ്റ്റർ എ. ബി. സേലം : എന്നാലും ഇങ്ങിനെയുള്ളവർ നന്നാകുമോ എന്നസംശയമാണു്.

മിസ്റ്റർ പി. നാരായണമേനോൻ ; ഇങ്ങിനെയുള്ള യാഥാസ്ഥിതികന്മാരെന്നോ, പിൻതിരിപ്പന്മാരെന്നോ, തുരപ്പന്മാരെന്നൊ, പഴയ മനസ്ഥിതിക്കാരെന്നൊ പറയുവാനുള്ള ആളുകളെ നന്നാക്കുന്നതിനുള്ള യാതൊരുമാർഗ്ഗവും ഇല്ലാത്തതുകൊണ്ടാണു് ഇത്തരം അഭിപ്രായങ്ങൾ..

Mr. K. S. Panicker (*Ezhuvs (Mukundpuran)*): On a point of order, Sir തുരപ്പന്മാർ എന്നു പറഞ്ഞുവാക്കു് പാർലിമെൻറിയല്ലേ ? Is it parliamentary to use the word?

മിസ്റ്റർ എ. ബി. സേലം: തുരപ്പന്മാരെന്നു വച്ചാൽ പെരിച്ചാഴി എന്ന അർത്ഥത്തിലല്ല പറയുന്നതു്.

Mr. Deputy President: The word "bandicoot" is not unparliamentary and it is not used in application to any particular individual.

മിസ്റ്റർ പി. നാരായണമേനോൻ : അതുകൊണ്ടു് തുരപ്പന്മാർ എന്ന ഒന്നുകൂടി പ്രസ്താവിച്ചുകൊണ്ടു്, ഇങ്ങിനെയുള്ള ആളുകളെ നന്നാക്കാൻവേണ്ടി അവക്കു പ്രത്യേകം ക്ലാസ്സുകൾവെച്ചു് അവർ നന്നാകുമോ എന്നു പരീക്ഷിക്കുന്നതിനുവേണ്ടി ഇനിയും ഏതെങ്കിലും ഒരു ഡിപ്പാർട്ട്മെണ്ടു ഭരത്വകുപ്പിലേക്കു വിട്ടുകൊടുക്കുവാൻ ഗവൺമെണ്ടുദ്ദേശിക്കുന്നുണ്ടെങ്കിൽ അതു വിദ്യാഭ്യാസവകുപ്പാകട്ടെയെന്നു് ഗവൺമെണ്ടിനോടപേക്ഷിച്ചുകൊണ്ടും, ആ ഡിപ്പാർട്ട്മെണ്ടാണു് നമുക്കു വിട്ടുകിട്ടേണ്ടതെന്നു മറ്റു പ്രതിനിധികളെ അറിയിച്ചുകൊണ്ടും ഞാൻ തല്ക്കാലം വിരമിച്ചുകൊള്ളുന്നു.

*മിസ്റ്റർ കെ. എസ്സു്. പണിക്കർ: മിസ്റ്റർ പ്രസിഡണ്ടു്, സർ, ഇന്നിവിടെയുള്ള കാര്യങ്ങളപ്പോലും ഉത്തരവാദിതഭരണം വേണ്ടെന്നുതന്നെ എനിക്കു തോന്നിപ്പോയി. ഞാൻ പരിപൂർണ്ണ ഉത്തരവാദിതഭരണത്തിനുവേണ്ടി വാദിക്കുന്ന ഒരാളാണെങ്കിലും ഇവിടത്തെ നില കണ്ടപ്പോൾ വേണ്ട എന്നു എനിക്കു തോന്നിപ്പോയി.

മിസ്റ്റർ എ. ബി. സേലം: എന്താണു കാരണം, സ്ത്രീയായിട്ടു സംസാരിച്ചതുകൊണ്ടോ?

മിസ്റ്റർ കെ. എസ്സു്. പണിക്കർ : മൂന്നു ഡിപ്പാർട്ട്മെണ്ടുകൾകൂടി മന്ത്രിഭരണത്തിനു വിട്ടുതരണമെന്നുള്ള ഒരു പ്രമേയം ഇവിടെ പാസ്സായിട്ടുണ്ടു്. നിർഭാഗ്യവശാൽ നമ്മുടെ ഗവൺമെണ്ടിനു അതു അംഗീകരിക്കുവാനുള്ള മനഃസ്ഥിതിയുണ്ടായില്ല. അതു സ്വീകരിക്കുവാനുള്ള സന്മനസ്സു നമ്മുടെ ഗവൺമെണ്ടിനുണ്ടായില്ലെങ്കിലും ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട മന്ത്രി അദ്ദേഹത്തിന്റെ ബുദ്ധിശക്തികൊണ്ടു് മൂന്നു ഡിപ്പാർട്ട്മെണ്ടു മേലധികാരികളെ ഇവിടെസൃഷ്ടിച്ചു. അതായതു്, പബ്ലിക്കു് ഹെൽത്തും പഞ്ചായത്തുംകൂടി ഒന്നായിരുന്നതു് രണ്ടാക്കി. അഗ്രികൾച്ചറും വെറ്ററിനറിയും വേർതിരിച്ചു് രണ്ടാക്കി. പഞ്ചായത്തും വില്ലേജു് കോട്ടും ഒന്നായിരുന്നതു രണ്ടായി വേർതിരിച്ചു. ഇങ്ങിനെ മൂന്നു ഡിപ്പാർട്ട്മെണ്ടുമേധാവികളെക്കൂടി എടുപ്പിച്ചു. ഇങ്ങിനെ മൂന്നു ഡിപ്പാർട്ട്മെണ്ടുകളെ സൃഷ്ടിക്കുവാനുള്ള സാമർത്ഥ്യം ഞങ്ങൾക്കുണ്ടായി. പരിപൂർണ്ണമായ ഉത്തരവാദിതഭരണം ഞങ്ങൾക്കു തരുകയില്ലെങ്കിൽ അതു മേടിക്കുമെന്നാണു് ഞങ്ങൾ പറയുന്നതു്. അതിനുള്ള സംഘബലം ഞങ്ങൾക്കുണ്ടാകും. സംഘട

*Speech not corrected by the Hon'ble Member.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

നശക്തിയും ഞങ്ങൾക്കുണ്ടാക്കും. യാചിക്കുകയില്ല, ബലമായിട്ട് ഞങ്ങൾ പിടിച്ചു വാങ്ങും. ജനങ്ങളാൽ തിരഞ്ഞെടുക്കപ്പെട്ട ഒരു പ്രസിഡണ്ടിനെ ഞങ്ങൾ ഈ നിയമസഭയിൽ വെക്കും. ഇപ്പോഴത്തെ നിയമസഭ നികൃതിദായകന്മാർ അടങ്ങിയ ഒരു നിയമസഭയാണ്. എന്നാൽ ഏറെവും വമ്പിച്ച ഒരു ജനവിഭാഗം നികൃതി കൊടുക്കാത്തവരായി ഉണ്ട്, അവരും ഗവമ്മെണ്ടിന്റെ പ്രജകളാണെന്നു ഗവമ്മെണ്ടു കരുതീട്ടില്ല. അങ്ങിനെയുള്ളവക്കുംകൂടി പ്രായപൂത്തിവോട്ടവകാശം നൽകിക്കൊണ്ടുള്ള ഒരു ഭരണപരിഷ്കാരം ഇവിടെ വരുമ്പോഴല്ലാതെ പരിപൂർണ്ണമായ ഉത്തരവാദിത്വഭരണത്തിൽ ഞങ്ങൾ എത്തുകയില്ലെന്നു ഞങ്ങൾക്കു നിശ്ചയമുണ്ട്. ഇപ്പോഴത്തെ കൊച്ചി ആക്ട് പ്രകാരം ഇനിയും ഒരു മന്ത്രിയെക്കൂടി സൃഷ്ടിക്കുവാനുള്ള അവകാശം ഞങ്ങൾക്കില്ല.

മിസ്റ്റർ എ. വി. മൂത്തേടൻ: ഉണ്ട്, വായിച്ചുനോക്കുക നല്ലവണ്ണം.

മിസ്റ്റർ കെ. എസ്സ്. പണിക്കർ: ഒരു അപ്പക്ഷണത്തിന്റെ ഓരോ ഭാഗമായി കിട്ടണമെന്നു ഞങ്ങൾ ആവശ്യപ്പെടുന്നില്ല. ഞങ്ങൾക്കു പരിപൂർണ്ണമായ ഉത്തരവാദിത്വഭരണം വേണം. അതിനുവേണ്ടി ഞങ്ങൾ വാദിക്കും. ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട ചാലക്കുടി മെമ്പർ പറഞ്ഞിട്ടുള്ള സാമുദായികമായ കടിപിടികളെല്ലാം കളയാനുള്ള വിദ്യ ഞങ്ങളെടുക്കും. ചില സ്വാർത്ഥികൾക്കു, അതായതു് വളരെക്കാലമായി കുത്തകയായിവെച്ചുകൊണ്ടിരുന്ന ഉദ്യോഗാപ്പക്ഷണങ്ങൾ കയ്യിൽനിന്നും പോയി എന്നു കാണുന്നവക്കു അമ്പോഴുണ്ടാകുന്ന ക്ഷോഭം മാറുവാൻ അധികം പ്രയാസമില്ല. ഞങ്ങൾ സംഘടിച്ചുകൊണ്ടു് അതിനെ എതിർക്കുവാൻ വരികയില്ലെന്നു വിചാരിക്കേണ്ട.

മിസ്റ്റർ എ. വി. മൂത്തേടൻ: ഞങ്ങൾ എന്നു പറയുന്നതു് ആരാണു്?

മിസ്റ്റർ കെ. എസ്സ്. പണിക്കർ: കൊച്ചിരാജ്യത്തിലെ ഞങ്ങൾ ആണു്. ആദ്യം തിരഞ്ഞെടുപ്പുകായ്ത്തിൽ ഒരു കക്ഷിയിൽ ചേരുക. ആ ആളെ ഒരു കക്ഷി തിരഞ്ഞെടുത്തില്ലെങ്കിൽ ആ കക്ഷിവിട്ടു് മറെറാരു കക്ഷിയിൽ ചേരുക. ഇങ്ങിനെയുള്ള ഉരുപ്പടികളെയല്ല ഞാൻ ഇവിടെ പറയുന്നതു്. പൊതുജനപ്രതിനിധിയായി, പ്രായപൂത്തിവന്നവരുടെ പ്രതിനിധിയായി ഈ നിയമസഭയിൽ വരുമ്പോൾ ഞങ്ങൾ പരിപൂർണ്ണ ഉത്തരവാദിത്വഭരണം വേണമെന്നു് ആവശ്യപ്പെടും. അപ്പോൾ എല്ലാ സമുദായങ്ങളും അവരവരുടെ അവകാശം പരിഗണിക്കാത്തവരായി ആരും കാണുകയില്ല. അങ്ങിനെയുള്ള ഒരു ആക്ട് ഇവിടെ നടപ്പിൽ വരണം. ഫ്രാഞ്ചൈസ് പരിഷ്കാരം ഇവിടെ നടപ്പിൽ വരണം. അതു വരാതെ ഞങ്ങൾക്കു് ഇങ്ങിനെ ഓരോ ഭാഗം ഭാഗമായിട്ടു് വിട്ടുകിട്ടേണ്ട ആവശ്യമില്ല. ഈ റസല്യൂഷനിൽ ഏതാണ്ടു കുറച്ചുകൂടി വിട്ടുതരണമെന്നാണു് പറയുന്നതു്. എന്നാൽ അഭ്യേഹത്തിന്റെ പ്രസംഗത്തിൽ പറയുന്നതു് മുഴുവനും തരണമെന്നാണു്. എന്നാൽ പ്രമേയം അങ്ങിനെ അയക്കാമായിരുന്നില്ലേ? ഇപ്രകാരം ഭാഗം ഭാഗമായിട്ടു് യാചിക്കുവാൻ ഞങ്ങൾ തയ്യാറില്ല. പ്രായപൂത്തിയുള്ള സകല സ്ത്രീപുരുഷന്മാർക്കും വോട്ടവകാശം കൊടുക്കണം. ഇങ്ങിനെയുള്ള പരിപൂർണ്ണ ഉത്തരവാദിത്വഭരണം ഈ നിയമസഭ നൽകണം. അതാണു് എന്റെ അപേക്ഷ. ഈവക മാറ്റിവെച്ചുകൊണ്ടുള്ള ഒരു പ്രമേയത്തെ അനുകൂലിക്കുവാൻ യാതൊരു നിവൃത്തിയുമില്ല.

***Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan** *(Vadakkancheri)* : Mr. President, "where there is a will there is a way" is an old saying. Therefore in considering this question of granting or transferring of more departments to be administered by the Minister the only question is whether the authorities in power are willing to do it or not. Absolutely no other difficulty existing the way of the resolution being accepted. If the authorities are willing it is easily done. If the authorities are not willing whatever we may say there is no use. That is a position in nut-shell.

The Government of Cochin Act unfortunately not being read by some Hon'ble Members as seen from the exhibitions here or being read, but not understood properly as exhibited by one Hon'ble Member I have to call the attention of the House to section 8 of the Constitution Act of Cochin which reads thus: It is profitable to read it, Sir, to read it again and over again. "His Highness, after consultation.....

(I) for the transfer from time to time of one or more subjects for being administered through the Minister appointed under this Act,....." As pointed out by the Hon'ble Member

*Speech not corrected by the Hon'ble member.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

for Mattancheri why the resolution has been worded in a restricted form distinct from a request for the grant of full responsible Government, as stated by him is because of the Constitution Act of Cochin. Whether we like it or not the Constitution Act of Cochin is the constitution binding in Cochin. That having been in force from 1113 till that is amended we shall not be right and we shall not be constitutional if we ask for anything more than what is contained therein or working on the lines mentioned there. And the purposes of the constitution will certainly be met by working under the Act. The prayer in the resolution, Sir, is that more departments be transferred, many more departments be transferred, the ultimate object being the process of transference of department from time to time of different departments, the ultimate goal is that all the departments be transferred to be administered by a Council of Ministers. That has been granted by the Act. The aim of the Government of Cochin, the goal which the Government of Cochin has kept in view to be reached, is not at a distant time, but at the shortest possible time is full responsible Government with His Highness, all in power which he ought to be and he will continue to be, but the executive functions of the Government of Cochin being carried on by a Council of Ministers. In 1113, Sir, we started with one Minister having 6 departments transferred to him under the rules made under Section 8 (i). The prayer by the resolution, again I repeat, Sir, is to have more departments, or to use the language of the Hon'ble Mover many more departments to be administered by the Minister. Where is the difficulty in accepting this resolution is the question. The only difficulty to the grant of the proposition can be a statement supported by facts that which the experience of 7 years it has been proved beyond a shadow of doubt that it is unsafe to transfer more departments. Is that the position of the Government I ask? Is the working of the constitution in Cochin through a Minister of departments 6 or more, is it one that make them decide that no more departments be transferred or even the departments that were transferred be taken back as was spoken through by the Hon'ble Member to my shame hailing from the Taluk to which I belong?

Mr. A. B. Salem *(Mattancheri)*: That is a Kunnamkulam idea.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan *(Vadakkancheri)*: Don't blame the people for the actions of a man who has run a muck. The people of Kunnamkulam are the most advanced people, they are constitutional and there is nothing wrong with them. There is the previous representative of that constituency, a most forward member fighting for political rights for advancement not inch by inch but by longer strades, that was the sort of member we have had and not the type of men who brought resolutions for the overhauling and transference of the Transferred Departments to be administered by the Diwan. It is a scheme to the whole people of the State to have such a resolution allowed to be tabled here, but the tabling cannot be disallowed. The only protest that we can register, Sir, is to treat that resolution with the contempt it deserves as was rightly done by the Budget Session of 1119.

Mr. C. V. Iyy *(Kunnamkulam)* It was not rightly appreciated, Sir.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan *(Vadakkancheri)*: Yes. There is a sort of disease, Sir, which has no remedy and unfortunately one of the Hon'ble Members is suffering from that. Even last night, Sir, attempts have been made by an Hon'ble Member to torpido the Constitution of Cochin, I shall not dilate on that further.

Mr. C. V. Iyyu *(Kunnamkulam)*: Who is that member?

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthssan *(Vadakkancheri)*: Search will find. He is very near you. To the resolution what was the attitude of this House. What was the attitude taken us by the House after the passing of the Constitution Act in 1113 Mithunam. We met here in 1114 Vrischigam we kept quiet. We allowed the whole year to pass through. We came to 1115, little attempts were made. Sir, and there was the answer of the Government. We came to 1116. Then Sir, we thought and rightly according to me we have waited sufficiently long for the transference of more departments. The Government on its own accord has not transferred and therefore, we prayed that they be pleased to transfer more. And what was the answer given by the Government? Absolutely no objection but please wait a little more. Well, a Government which has not been able to move as quickly as the non-official members thought that a little more time has to elapse. Very good, we obeyed, we waited, and where are we. From 1116 four more years have passed and that with what result?

Mr. A. B. Salem *(Mattancheri)*: We are far in advance.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezuhtassan *(Vadakkancheri)*: Far in advance but I do not know where. Unless the Constitution of Cochin has been a thorough failure—it must be the opinion of the Government and if the Government says it is so they will have a volume of questions as to what is the basis of the opinion—unless they are able to satisfy the representatives of the people

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

that for very good reasons they are not satisfied and so no more departments can be transferred, the Government will have immediately to transfer. That is the prayer brought forward by the Hon'ble Member. This is the most opportune time. We are on the eve of election. The electorate must be told, Sir, before they send their representatives for what period they are to be sent, what is the work expected of them, under the constitution if something more is not done by the Government the electorate will think that the term is for three years, a short period according to me, and the constitution will work with one Minister with these departments transferred to him. They must be told sufficiently early that the sixth Council of Cochin is a Council with sufficient time to do good work, sufficient departments to be worked by the representative of the people. Therefore it is the most opportune time. I would request, Sir, that the Government be pleased to work vigorously and before the 10th of this month, on which date this Council, I am sure, will be disolved, when the Council is disolved the Government may be pleased to come up with an announcement that the term of the next Council will be extended to five years, that the Council will have more powers, that there will be more Ministers than one, more departments will be transferred. That announcement will be a call to the electorate to see to it that they sent the right sort of men to work for five years, with more departments transferred to them, having a stable Ministry and not a single one as was attempted to be made by various interested quarters during the last few months. All these things must be told to the electorate. Sir, this is the most opportune time and my final request to the Government is that the Government may be pleased to announce in distinct and clear terms on the tenth of this month from that responsible place there that more departments will be transferred and that the terms of the Council would be five years for the reason that a good Minister who is not attempted to be driven away from his suit for frivalous reasons, who gets five years to work out a proper plan even if it be that giving of good drinking water to the littoral coasts of Cochin. More powers are necessary. Many things can be said, but it is not necessary to add anything more especially for want of time.

Rama Varmha Tampuran, M. B. E. *(Secretary to Government):* Sir, it is my duty when explaining the position of the Government with regard to this resolution to be as brief and as precise as possible. This is a very weighty resolution, and it is not for me as the Government Spokesman to indulge in any talk that might be interpreted ambiguously. At the last meeting a resolution was moved that a committee be appointed to enquire into and advise on further constitutional reforms that are required in this State. The Government opposed that resolution for the reason that there is no need for a committee for the Government to come to conclusions on this point. *(Hear hear).* The Government have made it abundantly clear from the very beginning of the framing of this constitution that they stand for responsible Government by the people of the State. And in the Constitution Act also there is provision for transference of more subjects when required. Therefore, they said that it is not necessary to have a committee to go into this question and report. To that position the Government still stick. They still consider that the goal that they fixed when they fixed, drafted and passed the Constitution Act is still the goal for them. They have not changed from that point of view.

Mr. L. M. Pylee *(Latin-Christians-Ernakulam):* Will it only remain a goal never to be reached?

Rama Varmha Tampuran, M. B. E. *(Secretary to Government):* The Hon'ble Member who moved the resolution asks whether it is only to remain as a goal for ever. There is one point to consider in that question. Rightly or wrongly by accident of history and by evolution of administrative machinery this Government like other sister Governments in the State have been trained in a particular form of administrative undertakings and they are governing things in a way which has been created and evolved in the last 100 years. Now when we have to change over from that to a new kind of wiring of the administration, naturally we have to know that we have to pass through a transitional stage. That cannot be avoided. The qualifications required for running a Government of the kind to which we have been accustomed in the last 100 years probably are different from the qualifications which are required for running a Government of the kind which the Hon'ble Member had in mind. It is not merely a transition on paper. It should be a complete change and translation in the outlook, in the methods of outlook and in the general handling of subjects and we cannot expect that such a change could be brought about in a very short time or in as short a time as some of the Hon'ble Members would suggest. Naturally that takes time. The transitional change itself has its own developments as we have had occasions and to find out in the last few years.

Mr. T. A. Ramachandra Ayyar *(Nellayi):* Seven years have passed. Is it short?

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Rama Varmha Tampuran, M. B. E. *(Secretary to Government):* Seven years is not too long a period in the constitutional history of any State. Neither the history of British Indian Provinces nor the history of any Indian State will prove that seven years is not a long period.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan *(Vadakkancheri):* But are we not far ahead?

Rama Varmha Tampuran, M. B. E. *(Secretary to Government):* The question is not whether we are far ahead intellectually or morally or whether A. B. C. are superior to X. Y. Z. The point is we have been handed down a method of administration and a method of administrative machinary built up in the last 100 years. We are going to change that, we are going to change over to a new state of things and the qualifications required to work the new state of things are quite distinct and different from those required to work things as they are. Naturally then we have to change, we want a transitional period and a transitional period where everyone of us can gain experience. I submit that seven years have not been a long period and the Government have either intentionally or unintentionally done nothing to thwart the growth of Consitutional Government in the state within the limited constitution that we have been working. The Government have extended every possible co-operation to the other side of this House to work out as liberally and as efficiently as possible, and we have not failed. Therefore I submit that the Government have not lost site of their goal nor have they changed their mind with regard to it, but it should not be made an accusation against them because no radical changes have been made in the last seven years that they have been apathetic to the wishes of the House. Far from it. They are whatching the constitution, they along with this House are gaining experience of the problems that faces and I am sure that the House can vary securely leave the fate of the new constitution in the hands of the Government. They may be rest assured that the Government will watch with interest and care and will do the right thing at the right time.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan *(Vadakkancheri):* May I know, what according to the Government is the standard for the transference of the department?

Rama Varmha Tampuran M.B.E. *(Secretary to Government):* That question is very irrelavent in a discussion like this because it is not by mathematical commutation of years that we can arrive at a solution for this.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan *(Vadakkancheri):* I only want to know what is the standard to be reached for further transference.

Mr. C. V. Iyyu *(Kunnamkulam):* After an overhaul it can be found.

***Mr L M. Pylee** *(Latin-Christians Ernakulam):* Sir, as explained before my intention is that, even though the resolution is moved according to the wording here it is one for the establishment of full responsible Government. Some members are opposed to the resolution because it is for partial responsible Government. But I may point out, Sir. logically many more departments might mean also all departments. I did not say that some few departments might be transferred to popular control; Or even if we take the wording of the resolution namely, "many more departments" which correctly displays the spirit in which the resotution is worded, I think those who oppose the resolution must support it because logically many more might mean all.

Mr. A. V. Moothedan *(Chalakkudi):* That is impossible. Many more cannot mean all. There should be something left behind, some balance.

Mr. L. M. Pylee *(Latin-Christians-Ernakulam):* That is the usual sense.

Mr. A. V. Moothedan *(Chalakkudi):* What is the position of the Hon'ble Member? Is he for full responsible Government?

Mr. L. M. Pylee *(Latin-Christians-Ernakulam):* My position is I am for full responsible Government.

Mr. A. V. Moothedan *(Chalakkudi):* Then the Hon'ble Member must withdraw his resolution.

Mr. L. M. Pylee *(Latin-Christians-Ernakulam):* I am not withdrawing my resolution. I have moved it and explained the sense in which I am moving it. Sir, very many remarks have been passed about this and it is a case crystal-clear and as is well-known it is a demand put forward on the floor of this House for the last so many years. The Hon'ble Member for Kunnamkulam said that I have tabled this resolution as an academic matter. Sir, when I lecture

*Speech not corrected by the Hon'ble Member.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

in a class, I realise I am lecturing to students and when I am on the floor of this House, I am sensible to feel I am in a parliamentary body and a Legislative Council. There is no mistaking about that. And if I tabled that resolution it has been as a practical measure, not for academic discussion. There are bodies, there are University Bodies, of which I am a member. There is the Senate, Academic Council and so on where academic matters might be discussed. We are here as members of the Legislative Council for introducing, for discussing, for considering practical measures, and I do not know why the Hon'ble Member for Kunnamkulam thought it an academic discussion. Of course, he thinks very often perversely and here is an instance of the perversity of thought when he said that this resolution has been tabled by me, a resolution which had been tabled by so many Hon'ble Members, has been brought by me as a matter of academic interest. I am sorry I have to speak in a personal strain. He found that the professor has come down to the level of a school-boy politician. Well, Sir, it is better to be a school-boy than a malicious being. I would like to be a school-boy, as school-boys are not malicious generally speaking, and I would prefer to be a school-boy than to be a malicious, perverted man *(Hear, hear)*, and exhibit it in circles like these where it ought not to be exhibited. I am proud that the Honble Member thought that I am a school-boy politician. I am proud of that term.

Then, Sir, I was stunned when he said that the opinion of the generality of the people of Cochin is against the introduction of full responsible Government. At least that is what I understood and I believe what the House understood, was that it is the concensus of opinion of the people of Cochin is against the establishment of responsible Government and they want to go back to the autocracy of the olden days. I say, Sir, it is an insult to the people of Cochin and the people of Cochin if they have manhood in them should drive out such a member from the Council. I ask this Hon'ble Member if he is standing for election again can he make it an issue of his election I challenge him—let him make it an issue and let him ask the people of Cochin to go back to the olden days. If he dares to do so, he will know the result. Sir, this sort of irresponsible talk has been going on—irresponsibility of an anti-deluvian anti-democratic type cannot be tolerated in this House. I am sorry I have to make these remarks. Well, Sir, such slander must not be taken seriously and I do not think the House takes it seriously With regard to the various talks, we saw the perversion of the version that came from that corner. That has been made clear. Therefore I need not deal with these things much in detail.

Now coming to the Government side, I have said in the House already that unfortunately the reply always for the resolutions like these, the reply from the Government side has been always evasive and elusive. And today what did you find? Even Mr. Amery could not have spoken better than our Secretary to Government. I am sorry the Government after having introduced it six or seven years ago is still sitting and watching. How long are you going to sit and watch? As my Hon'ble friend Mr. Ezhuthassan pointed out, can you say that the experiment of responsible Government in the State has been a failure. If it can be proved that that fact alone is the reason, the only reason that you can advance against granting further reforms, I ask, I challenge the Government can you prove it. Will it be brought from the Government side that this experiment has been a failure. Certainly not. They won't dare to say that, except perhaps from the one corner of Kunnamkulam, none will say so. Then, Sir, why should you sit and watch. You are keeping a goal and watching. I see an Amery in this House, not only in the British Parliament. Wait, wait, times are not propitious, war has broken out, we will give you, yes, we will give. Why always dangle this hope before us? Why is the answer always in the future tense, why not it be in the present tense? Why say, we will give you, why not say, we give. Come to the present times. Go with the world. Turn the democratic current of world for which millions are fighting and thousands are shedding their blood. If we love that ideal and if we shed the blood of Cochinites today in the battle-fields of the world, why should you bungle like this and ask us to wait, and say, we will sit and watch, we will give you. When? On the last day of judgment. Sir, I am disappointed at the answer given by the Government and there the Government says the Government is sympathetic. I am sorry this kind of evasive answer has come from the Government. I am afraid today's reply from the Government has been more reactionary than the replies that the Government have given before and, I am sorry, that after six or seven years. The Government is watching; The Government is watching when we, the non-officials, are running. Instead of you sitting and watching, run with us. If you cannot lead us, we will lead you. We thought that you will lead us. We thought the leadership is with you. Times have changed. It is time we give the lead. Instead of sitting and watching, come with us, follow us and follow our lead.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Sir, I have been provoked to speak because of the reactionary nature of the reply from the Government. I ask the Government finally, is it going to be a cry in the wilderness. My throat is hoarse. Morally my throat has become hoarse by asking for this, and today physically also it is hoarse. Is it going to be a cry in the wilderness? As my hon'ble friend Mr. Ezhuthassan pointed out, this is the time when the Government should make an announcement saying that we, the Government of His Gracious Highness the Maharaja, with whole-heartedness and sincereity, in the desire and anxiety for the well-being of the people, give this gift to the beloved people. Let us hope that on the eve of the elections that are going to take place, let us hope that on the eve of a new Council that is going to come into existence, let us hope that with a new era that is dawning in the world, in the new era in which we in Cochin will have to participate, that we shall have the four freedoms of President Roosevelt, the four freedoms under democratic institutions under the aegis of His Highness our beloved Maharaja. May He live long.

Mr. A. V. Moothedan *(Chalakkudi):* On a point of order. the issue is not clear. Is it for partial reform or full responsible Government?

Mr. L.M. Pylee (*Latin Christians-Ernakulam*) : The issue is found in the resolution'

Mr. A. V. Moothedan *(Chalakkudi):* Then the resolution is not seconded.

Mr. L. M. Pylee *(Latin Christians-Ernakulam):* I have been speaking a little more. I have not been speaking against the resolution or anything inconsistent. I have been speaking a little more than the limit prescribed It is the resolution that is technically put to the vote. If you can appreciate the spirit of the resolution and the ultimate intention of the resolution, you may vote. If you are going to accept technicalities, you will vote against the resolution.

Resolution put and carried

Mr. C. V. Iyyu *(Kunnamkulam):* Poll, Sir.

Ayes

1	Mrs. A. N. Menon	11	Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan
2	Mrs. Joshua	12	„ C. K. Nayar
3	Mr. T. A. Ramachandra Ayyar	13	„ M. Krishna Menon
4	„ V. K. Bhaskara Menon	14	„ K. Kunhirama Menon
5	„ L. M. Pylee	15	„ K. Narayana Menon
6	„ P. P. Devassy	16	„ N. Govinda Pai
7	„ A. B. Salem	17	„ C. J. Louis
8	„ George Panikulam	18	„ Thomas Karikkasseri
9	„ K. M. Ibrahim	19	„ K. R. Ramakrishnan
10	„ Marayil Nanu Menon	20	„ P. K. Krishnan.

Noes

1	Rama Varmha Tampuran, M.B.E.	7	Rao Sahib M. M. Paul
2	Mr. A. Madhava Prabhu	8	„ Dr. T. Verghese
3	„ M. Sivarama Menon	9	„ I. N. Menon
4	„ B. V. K. Menon	10	Mr. V. K. Aravindaksha Menon
5	„ C. J. Mathew	11	„ P. V. Raphale
6	„ S. Venkateswaran	12	Khan Sahib Y. Mohamed Roshan Sahib Bahadur
		13	Mr. A. V. Moothedan

20 for and 13 against.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan *(Vadakkancheri):* Nentrals also may be noted. Persons having no vote any also be noted. A poll means for, against and neutrals, I see for a ruling from the present chair that the Poll means for against and neutrals.

Mr. C. V. Iyyu *(Kunnamkulam):* There was a definite ruling before that the noutrals need not be noted.

Mr. Deputy President: There was no ruling. Wo need not consider it necessary, now also.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly